

Appl. No. 09/726,785  
Amendment/Response  
Reply to Office Action of  
August 18, 2003

Page 6 of 9

### REMARKS/DISCUSSION OF ISSUES

Claims 4-6 are pending in the application. Claim 5 has been amended.

Claims are amended for non-statutory reasons, to place them in standard U.S. patent practice format.

#### *Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112*

The Office rejects claims 4-6 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The Office states that no drawing or description shows the orientation of plane III and requests a figure that explains the relationship between planes I, II and III. Figure 5 has been amended to more clearly show the orientation of these planes. The orientation of these planes is also shown in Figure 6.

The Office states that the sloping ramp in claim 4 is not shown in the drawings or description. The sloping ramp is shown in Figures 5 and 6 as item 55. The Office inquires about the relationship between the sloping ramp and plane III. Sloping ramp begins at plane I and ends at plane III (as featured in claim 4).

The Office states that the specification and the drawings do not show or describe the plane III or/and the sloping ramp in perspective or in a plane. Figure 5 has been amended to more clearly show plane III and the sloping ramp and the correlation between planes I, II, III and the sloping ramp. Figure 6 also shows the correlations between the planes and the sloping ramp. The Office mentions that Figure 5 does not show the "D" dimension. Figure 5 has been amended to show this dimension. The "D" dimension is also shown in Figures 4 and 6. The Office mentions that items 58 and 59 shown in Figure 5 are not described in the specification. Item 59 is mentioned in the specification at page 6, line 3. Item 58 has been deleted from Figure 5.

Appl. No. 09/726,785  
Amendment/Response  
Reply to Office Action of  
August 18, 2003

Page 7 of 9

With respect to claim 5, the Office inquires as to how (52) can be a central part when it is shown in Figure 5 at the end. Figure 5 has been amended to make clear that the left side of the drawing is not the end of the display. Rather it is a central part of the display. Figure 1, similarly shows (52) as being a central part of the display.

The Office states that it is not clear how the first, second and third portions are extended in plane I. The first, second and third portions all have their bottoms in plane I as shown in Figures 5 and 6. The Office states that the sloping ramp (55) is not shown in Figure 5. Figure 5 has been amended to more clearly show the sloping ramp. The sloping ramp is also shown in Figure 6.

With respect to claim 6, the Office asks where the depth between the bottom and top of longitudinal channels is shown in the drawings. This depth is shown in Fig. 4 as "D", with the bottom of the longitudinal channels being plane I and the top of the longitudinal channels being plane II. This is also now shown in Figure 5.

The Office asks where the opposite edge of the plate is shown. It is on right hand side of Figure 6.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, of the remaining claims should be withdrawn.

#### ***Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112***

The Office rejects claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter the applicant regards as the invention. The Office mentions the limitation "said first portion (52)" lacks antecedent basis. Claim 5 has been amended.

Appl. No. 09/726,785  
Amendment/Response  
Reply to Office Action of  
August 18, 2003

Page 8 of 9

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, of claim 5 should be withdrawn.

### ***Objection to the Drawings***

The Office objects to the drawings asking that the interrelations between planes I, II and III be shown. Figure 5 has been amended to show this interrelation. This interrelation is also shown in Figure 6. In view of recent discussions with Examiner Shapiro, supplemental changes to the drawings have been made.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the objection to the drawings be withdrawn.

### **Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully requested that all objections and rejections be withdrawn. Allowance of all pending claims is earnestly solicited.

In the event that there are any outstanding matters remaining in the present application, the Examiner is invited to contact William S. Francos, Esq. (Reg. No. 38,456) at (610) 375-3513 to discuss these matters.

Except as otherwise stated in the previous Remarks, applicant notes that each of the amendments have been made to place the claims in better form for U.S. practice or to clarify the meaning of the claims; and not to distinguish the claims from applied art, otherwise narrow the scope, or to comply with other statutory provisions. Applicant reserves all entitled rights under the Doctrine of Equivalents.


If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and further replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account

Appl. No. 09/726,785  
Amendment/Response  
Reply to Office Action of  
August 18, 2003

Page 9 of 9

Number 50-0238 for any additional fees under 37 C.F.R. §1.16 or under 37 C.F.R.  
§1.17.

Respectfully submitted on behalf of:  
Philips Electronics North America Corp.



by: William S. Francos (Reg. No. 38,456)

January 7, 2004  
Volentine Francos, PLLC  
Two Meridian Blvd.  
Wyomissing, PA 19610  
(610) 375-3513